

In re Application of: Eilon Barnea et al
Serial No.: 10/705,459
Filed: November 12, 2003
Final Office Action Mailing Date: March 12, 2008

4

Examiner: Dibrino, Marianne
Group Art Unit: 1644
Attorney Docket: 26884

REMARKS

This Response is being made following a telephone interview with the Examiner, which occurred on 24 July 2008.

In the telephone interview, the lack of enablement rejection was discussed. The Applicant representative explained that the peptide was enabled as a research tool since it was shown to be derived from a known tumor antigen - MAGE-B2, and it was detected specifically in ovarian cancer cells (UCI-107) and not in other cell lines. The applicant representative further explained that it was not necessary to provide a showing that the peptide was immunogenic, since the peptide was being claimed as a peptide alone and not as a pharmaceutical composition.

The amendments above and the following remarks are in accordance with the understandings regarding allowable subject matter, as detailed in said communication. Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-37, 41, 42, and 50-71 are pending in the application. Of the above claims, Claims 1-36, 41-42 and 50-71 were withdrawn from examination under a restriction requirement as drawn to claims involving a non-elected invention. Claim 37 has been rejected. Claim 37 has now been amended. New Claim 72 has now been added.

35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph, Rejections

The Examiner has rejected Claim 37 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

The Examiner states that the specification does not disclose that SEQ ID NO: 20 is immunogenic – i.e. that it is capable at the least of stimulating CTL in vitro or inducing an immune response in vivo. In addition, the Examiner states that the specification does not provide any evidence that a patient's condition may be clinically improved using the peptide of SEQ ID NO: 20 as a vaccine.

Applicant maintains that the peptide of the present invention is enabled at least for research purposes in general and for cancer research in particular as is evident in the instant application. Firstly, the Applicant has shown that this peptide is derived from a known tumor

In re Application of: Eilon Barnea et al 5
Serial No.: 10/705,459
Filed: November 12, 2003
Final Office Action Mailing Date: March 12, 2008

Examiner: Dibrino, Marianne
Group Art Unit: 1644
Attorney Docket: 26884

antigen - MAGE-B2, and has been validated as being MHC bound peptides. Secondly, the Applicant has shown that the peptide was detected in a particular ovarian cancer cell line (UCI-107) and not in other cell lines – see Table 9, page 58 of the instant application.

Page 54, lines 22-25 of the instant specification clearly state that the peptides are useful in themselves for research purposes alone since study of MHC bound peptides whether immunogenic or not is of interest in general and to cancer research in particular.

"Those desired peptides that originate from putative tumor antigens were chemically synthesized to further evaluate the accuracy of their amino acid sequences and to enable to study them as MHC bound peptides and their significance as cancer antigens."

Support for Claim Amendments

Support for the phrase "specifically expressed in an ovarian cancer cell line UCI-107" may be found on page 58, lines 6-7

Implicit support for the phrase "isolated peptide" may be found relating to the DNA encoding same - see page 4 last paragraph and page 27 last paragraph.

In view of the above clarifications and claim amendments, Applicants believe to have overcome these 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejections.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 37 and 72 are now in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan
Registration No. 40,338

Date: October 20, 2008

Enclosures:

- Petition to Revive an Unintentionally Abandoned Application
- Request for Continued Examination (RCE)